

CHARGES WEST SIDE PLAN MULCTS CITY

Craig Says Railroad Gets Valuable Lands and Rights and Gives Little.

ESCAPES TAXATION TOO

Charles L. Craig, chairman of the legal committee of the West Side Association, continued yesterday before the Board of Estimate his assault upon the proposed plan for the improvement of the West Side, as submitted by the port and terminal facilities committee.

The burden of his argument was that the railroad company will be a great financial gainer through the proposed relocation of its tracks and the exchange of property necessary therefor.

Attacking the assertion of the committee that the major portion of the lands to be conveyed to the railroad "are practically valueless for general civic purposes," he pointed to the Fifty-ninth street yard, now leased to the railroad for \$100 a year, and for ten years after 1921 to be leased for \$15,425 a year. Under the plans of the committee this property is to go to the railroad for \$100 a year, and he declared that this was an inequitable exchange.

He asserted that the railroad is in fact selling to the city its franchise in the street south of Sixty-second street, despite the fact that the word "franchise" is not used, the right to operate in the street is designated as a "surface easement." The total amount paid to the railroad for this "surface easement" south of Sixty-second street is \$1,791.55.

Possesses a Loan in Taxes.

Mr. Craig contended that the New York Central pays a tax on this franchise on an assessed valuation that approximates, he said, to be somewhat in excess of the price paid for it by the city. He also averred that by granting to the railroad company an easement which will permit it to use the street for its tracks and other overhead or under surface for railroad purposes the city will free the railroad company from any obligation to pay a franchise tax on the Sixty-second street lands.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

Mr. Craig also pointed out that the assessed valuation of the New York Central West Side franchises for the purposes of franchise taxation was \$3,692,485.

HARBOR STRIKE SPREADS TO TUGBOAT ENGINEERS

7,000 Longshoremen Are Expected to Join in the Big Tieup To-day—Ferries Are Not Affected Thus Far.

THREATENED STRIKE

The threatened spread of the harbor tieup, which had shown signs of relaxation for a few days last week, came to pass yesterday. Following the failure at arbitration on Monday between the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association and the New York Boat Owners Association, the union leaders decided to call out the engineers who have been working pending a settlement of differences.

The difficulties of handling freight promised to be further complicated today by a strike of 7,000 longshoremen in Manhattan and Brooklyn. This was expected to block the coastwise shipping lines, which had no sign last week of agreement for increased wages in ways in which to make a decision on demands for raise, that have already been made to them, union leaders did not believe they could prevent their men from imitating the example set by the longshoremen of the Harbor Line. The only concern not affected will be Norton, Lilly & Co., of Brooklyn, which granted advances last week.

The mechanical staffs of the Red Star Line, which operate the tugboats, are also expected to join the strike. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

Among the first men to respond to the call of the union officials were the engineers on nine tugs operated by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, who were expected to strike at 10 o'clock this morning. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners. The tugboats are used to move the large transatlantic liners.

WOMEN TAILORS MAY STRIKE.

Fifth Avenue Employees Will Vote on Question To-night.

The Fifth Avenue women tailors, of whom there are some 3,000, are going to vote to-night on the question of a general strike in aid of the 6,000 cloakmakers who are on strike.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

The women tailors of Fifth Avenue are organized in what is known as Local No. 34 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

O. OSBORNE WITNESS JUSTIFIED BY COURT

Safford, Hotel Clerk, in Rae Tanner Case, Gains a Legal Victory.

JARED FLAGG WINS POINT

Three important convictions won by the Government within the last year and a half were reversed by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in opinions handed down yesterday. The first case reversed was that of Franklin D. Safford, the clerk in the Hotel Kensington.

Safford was convicted in the Hotel Kensington case of perjury in the series of prosecutions growing out of the Tanner case. He was sentenced to serve nine months for committing perjury in the case of Rae Tanner during the series of prosecutions growing out of the Tanner case.

Another important conviction upset by the higher court was that of Jared Flagg, a 52-year-old man, who was convicted in the United States District Court in November, 1914, of using the mails to defraud in the promotion of his brokerage scheme, and sentenced to eighteen months. A reversal of the conviction of Charles L. Stager, a customs examiner, found guilty of conspiring to divulge confidential customs information, is also granted by the appellate court.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

Judge Ward writes the opinion in the Safford case, with Judges Mayer and Rogers concurring. He characterized the evidence against Safford as "paltry" and "unconvincing." He also pointed out that Safford was a clerk in the Hotel Kensington, and that he was not a party to the Tanner case.

TWO BOY COPS GRAB CRUEL WAGON DRIVER

Juveniles Complimented by Magistrate in Night Court for Making Arrest.

Patrolman Joseph Fingerman, 13 years old, of the juvenile force attached to the Fifth street police station, was patrolling a self-imposed beat along First avenue last evening when he beheld the driver of a wagon suddenly pull up near Fifth street, jump to the street and make a dash for two small boys who had been hitching a ride.

What that driver did to the two small boys before they could escape got Patrolman Fingerman's dander up to such a pitch that he ran out and placed the driver under arrest. It is doubtful if Fingerman would have been successful in holding to the driver if another one of the juvenile force, namely Joseph Schellowitz, 11 years old, had not grabbed the driver until Policeman McWilliams of the regular force came along.

The driver, thus being made a secure captive, was taken to night court. Patrolman Fingerman told the story to Magistrate Deuel and it was corroborated by Patrolman Schellowitz. Both of these young men were highly complimented by the magistrate and went away very happy, no doubt.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

The driver, who gave the name of John Orosz of 267 East Eighty-fifth street, was sentenced to two days in jail.

JOHN WANAMAKER — THE STORE FOR MEN

Describing Two Groups of Suits Which Men Like Exceedingly Well

The suits at \$25 and Custom Shirts of Genuine Shantung

We have just purchased at an advantageous price a large quantity of genuine shantung, natural shade, and will make out of it shirts to be cut to measure, at \$7 each; pleated bosoms, \$50 extra.

Custom shirts, in other materials, \$3.50 to \$20 each.